

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Boys & Girls Clubs of Indianapolis

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 2:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since BGC Indy's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: BGC Indy
SITE: T.C. Steele Elementary School #98 (IPS)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1 tutor
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1

DATE: March 6, 2007
REVIEWERS: MC/SF
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:15 PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		The tutor worked one-to-one with each student (two students but each was separated). One student worked on the blackboard with the tutor doing math problems while the other student worked on a worksheet related to nouns and verbs. Each student had a binder that documented lessons completed and lessons to be done. The tutor pulled worksheets from the binders for students to work on and shifted back and forth between students to provide instruction. Lesson generally matched description in provider application, although some components described in lesson plans (such as additional instructional strategies and activities) were not present.
Instruction is clear	X		The students did appear to understand what was expected of them, and the tutor was aware of the worksheets/assignments that each student needed to complete based on the binders. However, most instruction provided was correction based on what was done on the worksheets as opposed to providing instructional or learning strategies for students. For example, the student doing multiplication tables was using fingers to count up the answers; the tutor did not provide strategies to the student to improve the student's ability to multiply without using fingers. The tutor's role appeared to be more related to correction or assistance as opposed to actual instruction or explanation of concepts.
Time on task is appropriate	X		Students remained 100% on task for the entire period observed. The tutor skillfully shifted from one student to the next while ensuring that each student remained on task.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		The tutor was positive and provided positive feedback, but again, few strategies were offered to connect what was being worked on to higher order thinking skills or larger literacy or math skills. The tutor generally checked in with students to see how they were doing on their worksheets and provided assistance or correction as requested. The tutor was generally aware of the child's level (based on the children's binders) and work required.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>2:1</u>	X		At 2:1, ratio was less than that described in the provider application.

